UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2490th MEETING: 27 OCTOBER 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2490)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(*a*) Letter dated 17 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16048);	
(*b*) Letter dated 18 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16051);	
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/15943)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2490th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 27 October 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Abdullah SALAH (Jordan).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2490)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   (*a*) Letter dated 17 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16048);
   (*b*) Letter dated 18 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16051);
   (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/15943)

The meeting was called to order at 11.55 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
(*a*) Letter dated 17 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Senegal to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16048);
(*b*) Letter dated 18 October 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16051);
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/15943)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2481st meeting, I invite the representative of Senegal to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kamara (Senegal) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2481st meeting, I invite the President of the Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation of the Council to take places at the Security Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Wasiuddin (Vice-President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2481st meeting, I invite Mr. Mueshihange to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mueshihange took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): In accordance with decisions taken at the 2481st to 2486th and 2488th meetings, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Botswana, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Mozambique, Nigeria, Peru, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sahnoun (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba), Mr. Kulawiec (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. van Well (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Somogyi (Hungary), Mr. Krishnan (India), Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Wabuge (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. Fafowora (Nigeria), Mr. Arias Stella (Peru), Mr. Koroma (Sierra Leone), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. Abdalla (Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Slim (Tunisia), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Vene-

zuela), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Turkey and Uganda in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kirca (Turkey) and Mr. Otunnu (Uganda) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): Member of the Council have before them document S/16085, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Togo, Zaire and Zimbabwe. I should also like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to document S/16081, which contains the text of a letter dated 25 October from the representatives of Canada, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States addressed to the President of the Council.

7. The first speaker is the representative of the Sudan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

8. Mr. ABDALLA (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to express to you and to the members of the Council my delegation's thanks and appreciation for being allowed to participate in the deliberations of the Council on the item on its agenda, the situation in Namibia. We should also like to express to you our warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. Your wisdom and competence in the diplomatic sphere, as well as the commitment of your country, Jordan, to the cause of colonial peoples whose fundamental human rights are being flouted and whose right to self-determination is being denied will assist the Council in achieving the fruitful and constructive results we all desire.

9. We should also like to express our appreciation to Mr. Noel Sinclair, the representative of Guyana, for his meritorious efforts in the service of the Council during his presidency last month.

10. The Council is meeting for the second time in five months, to consider the question of Namibia. At the end of last May, acting on the recommendation of the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, the Council met to consider developments in Namibia with a view to placing them in their true perspective in the light of recent statements by South Africa linking Namibian independence to an extraneous issue that was not germane to the question of independence for that Territory.

11. As is well known, the meetings of the Council resulted in the adoption of resolution 532 (1983), in which the Council decided to mandate the Secretary-General to undertake consultations with the parties concerned with a view to securing the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978). The Secretary-General carried out his mission brilliantly and submitted the report contained in document S/15943. I take this opportunity to express to the Secretary-General our appreciation for his painstaking efforts and, in particular, for the way in which he conducted the consultations in southern Africa and for his insistence on confining the consultations to the remaining outstanding issues connected with the principle of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) and within the framework of resolution 532 (1983).

12. For Africa and the international community as a whole, it was a good augury that the five Western States of what is known as the contact group decided to play a major role in the intense and delicate negotiations that finally led to the adoption of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, approved in resolution 435 (1978). At that time my country had the honour of serving as President of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and we stated on its behalf that the United Nations plan as a whole did not deal with all of Africa's aspirations to ensure the achievement of the independence of the people of Namibia, but that we accepted it as the minimum African position, in the hope that it might lead in a few months to proclaiming Namibia an independent and free country joining the family of other free and independent nations. [*2088th meeting, paras. 87-96.*]

13. At that time, the Sudan made a number of observations and proposals designed to close certain gaps in resolution 435 (1978) and to eliminate the ambiguity in its content. The subsequent negotiations concerning the implementation of the resolution proved the validity of the African feeling, characterized at first by vigilance and caution and then by co-operation and flexibility.

14. Between 1978 and 1981, certain questions created by South Africa surfaced one after the other. The first was a demand by South Africa for an increase in the number of inspection posts in the demilitarized zone and for the stationing of some elements of its forces at those posts. At that time we were told that these were legitimate demands, giving South Africa the guarantee that the forces of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) would not infiltrate through neighbouring countries. We all remember the difficult decision that the front-line States had to take and its implications for their territorial integrity and sovereignty. Then there emerged the question of the impartiality of the United Nations. That was followed by a request by South Africa for the participation of what it called the internal parties in the current negotiations.

15. Thanks to the constructive flexibility and spirit of co-operation of the leadership of SWAPO and the front-

line States and Nigeria, Africa emerged from each round of negotiations more capable of, and more cautious about, facing the prevarication and strategems of the Pretoria authorities in their attempts to undermine resolution 435 (1978).

16. During 1982 the *apartheid* authorities started to speak publicly of what had only been whispered before—that is, the so-called linkage between the withdrawal of the Cuban troops in Angola and the implementation of the United Nations plan. Recently we heard the representative of the racist régime state in the Council that there is support for its position within the international community [*see 2481st meeting, para. 149*]. This in itself not only constitutes defiance of the will of the international community but also represents disdain for the position and weight of the Organization. Representatives of the Non-Aligned Movement, of the OAU, of the League of Arab States and of the Socialist countries who have spoken in the Council have rejected the linkage issue, as a whole and in all its parts, and have stated that, in addition to being extraneous to the contents of resolution 435 (1978), the linkage issue is not negotiable and cannot be considered within the framework of the authority of the Council.

17. In this respect, I wish to refer to the following statement by the Foreign Minister of the Sudan in the General Assembly on 11 October this year:

> "following [the] completion [of the Secretary-General's mission] we deem it necessary that the Security Council commence the implementation of the peace plan according to an agreed timetable which would be binding on South Africa and which would not involve extraneous issues such as linkage of the independence of Namibia with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. Independence is one of Namibia's basic legitimate rights and it should not be subject to conditions or compromises. It is a right that calls for urgent international action to exert pressure on the Government of South Africa to enable the Namibian people to exercise its right to self-determination."[1]

18. My delegation is pleased that the Secretary-General has restored the negotiations to their normal course and that agreement has been reached in regard to some pending issues concerning the setting-up of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) and its mandate, as well as the electoral system. We welcome what has been achieved in regard to UNTAG and are gratified at the statement in the Secretary-General's report that, as far as UNTAG is concerned, the prolonged and intensive consultations resulted in resolving virtually all the outstanding difficulties. As for the electoral system, Sudan supports the position of SWAPO and the African front-line States in regard to the necessity of reaching agreement on the electoral system before starting the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), bearing in mind that there has already been agreement that the system would be based on single-member constituencies or proportional representation.

19. Africa participated effectively and actively in all the negotiations initiated by the Western contact group. It gave serious and sincere consideration to everything put forward by the contact group in its quest for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), hoping that that quest would lead to the fulfilment of the legitimate aspirations of the people of Namibia to exercise self-determination and obtain independence. We have in more than one forum expressed our appreciation of the efforts of the five Western States in this respect. We feel that its mission has been completed and that it is now for the Council to shoulder actively its full responsibilities with efficiency and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. In this respect, my delegation calls on the Council to take the following measures: first, to formulate a specific timetable for the implementation of the peaceful settlement agreed upon; secondly, to reject any linkage between the independence of Namibia and any elements extraneous to resolution 435 (1978); thirdly, to call on South Africa to inform the Secretary-General by a certain date of its position on the electoral system; fourthly, to ask South Africa to undertake immediately, in accordance with that timetable, the implementation of resolution 435 (1978); and fifthly, if South Africa continues to defy the authority of the Council, to meet forthwith in order to apply the mandatory sanctions provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

20. The Sudan and its people and Government are following the developments in Namibia with grave concern. The Sudan will continue providing support and assistance to the struggling people of Namibia, led by SWAPO, its sole and legitimate representative, until victory. The Sudan will keep its promise to participate in efforts to ensure implementation of resolution 435 (1978), in accordance with what President Gaafar Nimeiri said in 1978 concerning the Sudan's commitment to be part of UNTAG.

21. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Peru. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

22. Mr. ARIAS STELLA (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Allow me first of all, Mr. President, to congratulate you most sincerely on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October. My delegation is particularly pleased that the representative of a friendly country and an active member of the Non-Aligned Movement of your ability, skill and good judgement is guiding these debates.

23. Once again the members of the international community are appearing before the Council to condemn the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa and to seek a solution to the tragedy of a people whose hope of achieving the exercise of their inalienable right to independence has repeatedly been frustrated.

24. In this context, I wish to state my delegation's deep appreciation of the efforts of the Secretary-General in compliance with the mandate given him in Council resolution 532 (1983) and of the special interest he has shown in the question of Namibia from the moment he assumed his responsibilities. His report could not be more eloquent nor his conclusions of greater concern. Namibia's indepen-

dence is an indispensable pre-condition to guaranteeing peace in southern Africa. Opposition to this and persistence in illegal occupation exacerbates the conditions for the outbreak of a conflict of incalculable dimensions that would increasingly endanger international peace.

25. As has been rightly stated by the representative of Nigeria,

> "The story of Namibia is a tragedy not only for the people of Namibia but also for people of conscience throughout the world. It is the tragic story of a peaceful but proud people who have been subdued by force and subjected to institutionalized racism." [*2483rd meeting, para. 17.*]

This bleak history and the justice of the Namibian cause have reinforced as never before the generally-held conviction that independence for its people must not be further delayed.

26. Many and difficult are the pitfalls which have been overcome so far thanks to international support and solidarity. We are now faced with yet another difficulty, to the solution of which we must apply our best efforts. A few days ago the representative of South Africa put forward the argument in this chamber that the so-called linkage "is acknowledged and has support within the international community" [*2481st meeting, para. 149*]. However, the wide-ranging and varied support the Council has given to the unconditional independence of Namibia allows no grounds for such an assertion.

27. In this connection, we draw attention to the attitude of one of the members of the contact group, which has dissociated itself from this demand—an attitude shared by other members of the Group of Western States. These statements lead us to hope that this sensible and realistic position may win new adherents in the interest of the freedom of the Namibian people and international peace and security, which affect all the Members of the United Nations without exception.

28. For those reasons, immediate implementation of the Council resolutions on Namibian independence is essential. We consider the solution of outstanding problems concerning UNTAG, achieved during the visit of the Secretary-General to South Africa, to be a positive step. Similarly, we are pleased to know of the readiness of SWAPO to sign a cease-fire agreement and to continue to co-operate with the Secretary-General to facilitate the rapid implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

29. The international community in general and my country in particular hope that Namibian independence will be achieved as soon as possible, with full respect for its territorial integrity and the will of its people and within the sole existing legal framework: that is, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice[2] and the relevant resolutions of the Council. We trust that, at the conclusion of its deliberations, the Council will be able to adopt the measures most appropriate for ensuring that the tragedy of the Namibian people is brought to an end.

30. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Hungary. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

31. Mr. SOMOGYI (Hungary): First of all, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of October and to express my confidence that your known diplomatic skill and wisdom will contribute greatly to the success of the work of the Council. At the same time, I should like to place on record our appreciation of the exemplary manner in which Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana conducted the work of this august body last month.

32. It is a great honour and privilege for me to express to you, Mr. President, and, through you, to the other members of the Council, my delegation's thanks for the opportunity accorded to us to participate in the discussion of this very important item.

33. The question of Namibia has been discussed in the Council many times. Five years ago, in the course of those deliberations, a plan for Namibia's independence was elaborated and accepted. Resolution 435 (1978), which was the result of extensive, wide-scale consultations among the interested parties, envisaged ways and means to achieve Namibia's independence. It contains concrete steps, starting with a cease-fire and ending with elections to be held under United Nations supervision.

34. Unfortunately, however, the provisions of that resolution, which have been confirmed and reconfirmed time and again, have not yet been implemented. Namibia, despite all the United Nations resolutions and the ever-growing demand of world public opinion, is still prevented from attaining independence. The illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa is still going on; foreign economic and political interests are still prevailing; the natural and human resources of that Territory are still plundered and abused; the people of Namibia are still deprived of all the fundamental human rights, of self-determination and of independence.

35. It is clear to us all that this situation is in sharp contradiction with all norms of international law, as well as the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. South Africa's Mandate over that Territory was terminated as early as 1966 by General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI), and, since then, the Assembly and the Council alike have adopted numerous resolutions to the same effect. Nevertheless, the situation has not improved, rather it has further deteriorated in the past years. Ever-newer obstacles have been introduced by the racist régime and its Western supporters in order to hamper the just and lasting solution of the problem of the much-suffering Namibian people.

36. My delegation has studied carefully the report of the Secretary-General [*S/15943*] in which he gave a correct account of his consultations with the representatives of South Africa. In his report, the Secretary-General concluded that the consultations with the representatives of

the Government of South Africa resulted in resolving virtually all of the outstanding issues, as far as UNTAG was concerned. However, it was also indicated in that report that "the position of South Africa regarding the issue of the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola as a precondition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) still makes it impossible to launch the United Nations plan." [*Ibid., para. 25.*]

37. The representative of South Africa has once again reiterated his Government's position to the Council [*2481st meeting*] and confirmed it as being irrevocable.

38. Only a very few support the position of South Africa on this linkage, on the false pretext that the security interests of all the parties have to be addressed. But it should be emphasized again, in no uncertain terms, that resorting to prevarication and introducing extraneous factors only harm the cause and delay the genuine settlement of this long-standing issue.

39. The purpose of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola is so clear to everybody that it needs no elaboration. They have been invited by the legitimate Government of Angola to defend its territory against armed aggression by South Africa. Their stay or withdrawal is a matter of bilateral agreement between the two Governments.

40. At the same time it must be obvious to everyone that no legitimate explanation can be given for the South African presence in Namibia, for the barbarous attacks the troops of the Pretoria régime repeatedly launch against Angola and the other front-line States, or for the aggressive political course pursued by Pretoria, one that constitutes unprovoked, premeditated intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign African States and endangers the peace and security of that region.

41. As for the security of South Africa, it is threatened not by its neighbours but by its own *apartheid* system, by its own policy of colonialism and aggression.

42. South Africa could not have defied the resolutions of the United Nations and could not have hindered their implementation without the support of its allies, primarily the United States. Therefore, we urge the members of the Western contact group of five—first of all, those which are members of the Council—to reconsider their position and exert pressure on South Africa to ensure its compliance with the resolutions of the United Nations.

43. My delegation believes that the Council has to act quickly and resolutely this time, bearing in mind the dangers in the southern part of Africa stemming from the intransigence of the racist régime. First of all, the Council has unconditionally to reject the linkage between the independence of Namibia and the presence of internationalist Cuban troops in Angola. Secondly, a specific timetable should be decided upon to implement without further delay resolution 435 (1978). If South Africa fails to abide by Council resolutions, the Council should consider mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

44. My delegation believes that the respect and the authority of the United Nations is at stake if the racist régime of South Africa is allowed to get away with its intransigence. It is imperative for all of us to preserve the respect for this body in order to maintain international peace and security.

45. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Czechoslovakia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

46. Mr. KULAWIEC (Czechoslovakia) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, may I thank you for the opportunity given to me to speak in the Council and to take part in the work of the present important meetings. May I likewise congratulate you upon your assumption of the presidency of the Council and to wish you success in carrying out this important and complicated mission. We are convinced that your great professional qualities, as well as your experience spanning many years, are a pledge that under your direction our work will be effective.

47. We should also like to pay tribute to the work of the representative of Guyana, Mr. Noel Sinclair, who performed the duties of President of the Council in September of this year.

48. It is the second time this year, and after many other occasions since the adoption of Council resolution 435 (1978), that this body is required to consider the question of Namibia. During the last five years—in other words, since the adoption of the United Nations plan to ensure the independence of the Namibian people—the question of Namibia has frequently been discussed in this body and, each time, an urgent appeal for the implementation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and of the imperative rules of international law has been sounded, as well as an appeal for the decolonization of Namibia and the adoption of appropriate measures so that the Namibian people might at last be granted an opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination.

49. However, we are forced once again to observe that these appeals have led to no results whatsoever. The Government of Pretoria ignores both the legally binding decisions of the United Nations concerning termination of the Mandate of South Africa in Namibia as well as the decisions adopted subsequently by the General Assembly and the Security Council. It refuses to end its unlawful occupation of the Territory, and is continually building up its troops there; they now number more than 100,000 men. It is organising the forcible recruitment of young Namibians whom it uses for the purpose of repression and murder of their own brothers. It is inflicting cruel, large-scale repression upon the civilian population of the country, even using mercenaries for this purpose. It is killing those who fight for freedom and independence in Namibia arbitrarily imprisoning a number of political leaders and supporters of SWAPO. It is torturing imprisoned patriots. It is mercilessly exploiting the human, natural and material resources of Namibia. It is constantly making attempts to cobble together a coalition of collaborators and traitors,

and is trying to perpetuate its domination in Namibia by means of the forcible introduction of colonial, political and constitutional schemes. It is continuing to make efforts to splinter the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

50. The territory of Namibia is also used by the Pretoria régime as a staging area for armed aggression against neighbouring independent African States. We must here mention primarily the attacks on Angola and the occupation of part of the territory of that country; the attacks upon Mozambique, the most recent of which took place a week ago; and the forays and subversive action against Zambia, Lesotho and Zimbabwe. South Africa is striving to bring about the downfall of the progressive, anti-colonial and anti-imperialist Governments of the front-line States. Armed aggression is the instrument for the implementation of its regional policy, aimed at taking over the whole of southern Africa. As a result of Pretoria's policy, the region has been converted into one of the most serious flash-points of crisis in the world today. It is not only the source of regional tensions but a threat to peace and security in general.

51. However, we are not speaking only of the policy of South Africa. We are speaking also about the position of certain Western States. They are the ones blocking the implementation of the United Nations plan; the racist policy of occupation and aggression adopted by South Africa is possible only because of the comprehensive support of the United States, certain other Western Powers and Israel. Were it not for the diplomatic, political, strategic, military and economic co-operation of those States, the Pretoria régime would be unable to ignore United Nations decisions, the will of the international community and world public opinion. The support of the West provides favourable conditions for all the manifestations of the internal and external policies of the *apartheid* régime, manifestations which are worthy of condemnation and which are condemned, including the flouting of the elementary rights of the Namibian people. Pretoria is met halfway by those States which, in the course of the discussion of economic sanctions in the Security Council, repeatedly use their right of veto, as well as by the International Monetary Fund, which has magnanimously offered it a loan of over $US 1 billion.

52. Pretoria is acquiring, either as direct supplies or through the granting of licences, the weapons and military *matériel* needed to sow terror inside the country and to carry out its policy of occupation and aggression directed against other States. The aid provided by the West and by Israel has contributed, and continues to contribute, to the marked progress in Pretoria's nuclear potential, which is arrousing fears not only in the neighbouring States but among peace-loving mankind as a whole. The economic monopolies of the Western countries are making a large contribution to supporting the functioning of the *apartheid* machine, and together with South African companies are participating intensively in the plunder of the potential of the future Namibian economy.

53. Thus it is no accident that the work of decolonization, the exercise of basic human rights and the establishment of peace and security in southern Africa are opposed by the very forces that are now striving to destabilize the situation in Europe and throughout the world. These are the forces that are whipping up the arms race, increasing the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war and acting against the vital interests of the peoples of all continents.

54. The present Administration of the United States has been instrumental in putting forward the completely unjustified and totally unacceptable demand to link the granting of independence to Namibia with the withdrawal of the internationalist Cuban units from Angola. The units went to Angola at the request of the Angolan people and Government under an inter-State agreement in order to help protect the country against the armed invasion of South African troops and against the onslaughts of Pretoria, organized and financed by traitors and mercenaries. Washington is striving to direct its efforts to achieve an early solution of the Namibian question against the revolutionary Government of Angola and trying to reverse the progressive, anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist developments in Angola. In Pretoria it has found a diligent proxy which is seeking any excuse to continue and perpetuate its colonial domination of Namibia. This is a kind of obstruction which has not the slightest foundation in international law and is devoid of any logical ties. This is flagrant interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign States.

55. Czechoslovakia condemns the continuing occupation of the Territory of Namibia by the troops of the *apartheid* régime, the denial to the people of Namibia of their right to self-determination and the acts of aggression against independent African States. We categorically reject any attempts to link the legitimate demand concerning the granting of independence to Namibia with any questions that bear no relation to this problem. We also reject any other obstructions by South Africa and its Western allies. We stand in total solidarity with the liberation struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, their sole legitimate representative, and support their struggle. We have stated this on a number of occasions, both from the rostrum of the United Nations and on other occasions. For instance, in connection with the mission of the United Nations Council for Namibia to Czechoslovakia in April this year,[3] as well as at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence.[4] This position of ours has been confirmed also by the highest figure in Czechoslovakia, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovakia Communist Party, the President of Czechoslovakia, Gustav Husak, in the course of a reception for the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma, 14 days ago in Prague. It is our conviction that the adoption of effective measures against any further blocking of the granting of independence to Namibia cannot be further postponed. Like the majority of speakers before us, we too are of the opinion that it is only through the introduction of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter that it will be possible to compel the Pretoria régime, in fulfilment of the United Nations plan, to grant

independence to Namibia. At the present meetings of the Council, decisions should be adopted to ensure achievement of the intended goal, namely, the definitive decolonization of Namibia and the exercise of the right to self-determination by its people, who are enduring unbelievably excruciating suffering.

56. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Turkey. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

57. Mr. KIRCA (Turkey): Sir, I wish to thank the members of the Council for giving me the opportunity to make this statement. I should also like to express our satisfaction at seeing you, the representative of a country with which Turkey enjoys brotherly relations, presiding over the Council this month. My delegation is confident that you will guide the work of the Council in the best possible way. I also wish to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana on his presidency last month.

58. The Council is now engaged in the pressing task of reviewing recent developments concerning the question of Namibia, with the aim of bringing about the independence of Namibia without further delay. If the past history of the Namibian question is of any relevance, this is not an easy task, but it is a long-overdue one.

59. This year, during the last few months, important events have taken place which have created a certain momentum in the stalled diplomatic and political process concerning Namibia. First, the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris in April, and then the timely Council meetings have provided an impetus for international action. The deliberations of the Council, culminating on 31 May with the adoption of resolution 532 (1983), have also served to highlight the special responsibility which the United Nations holds for achieving independence for Namibia—a sacred trust of the United Nations.

60. This important resolution, 532 (1983), has reaffirmed the earlier resolution of the Council, resolution 435 (1978), by which the Council adopted the plan for the independence of Namibia. South Africa, the illegal occupier of Namibia, has since then prevented the implementation of that plan in defiance and mockery of all the efforts of the international community.

61. It is on this basis that the Secretary-General, carrying out a most difficult mandate given to him under resolution 532 (1983), has conducted valuable consultations with the parties concerned with a view to securing the speedy implementation of resolution 435 (1978).

62. We view favourably the concise and pertinent report prepared by the Secretary-General on the results of his mission, which included a working trip to southern Africa [*S/15943*]. He has thus been able to observe the situation at close quarters and hold direct contacts. In this way he has, first of all, been able to clear away the remaining issues concerning the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), issues left open by South Africa. Furthermore, and perhaps more important, he has been able to draw a very clear picture of the present situation regarding Namibia. This clear and accurate description of the situation will facilitate the steps which need to be taken. We are grateful to the Secretary-General for his valuable efforts. At the same time, we have taken note of the constructive attitude adopted by SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, during those consultations by declaring its readiness to accept a cease-fire at once. Thus the pre-implementation diplomatic process could be considered to be completed. Yet the negotiating process this time faces a South African pre-condition, the so-called linkage, which lies outside the scope of the peace plan envisaged by resolution 435 (1978).

63. Therefore, it still is not possible to set a date for a cease-fire and to proceed with the implementation of the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia. The further frustration of the legitimate and rightful national aspirations of the Namibian people not only places a burden on the conscience of the international community, but also is fraught with dangers for regional, as well as international, peace and security.

64. We believe that, in dealing with this critical problem, primary attention should be paid to the suffering and injustices which fall on the Namibian people as a result of the prolongation of the illegal occupation and repression by South Africa. The time has long since come for the Namibians rightfully to become masters of their own land, their own resources and their own destiny.

65. I should like to ask what the crucial difference is between Namibians and other peoples in Africa and elsewhere that, while so many peoples have attained their freedom, Namibians are being relentlessly kept under the most repressive form of colonialism. The answer seems to be that the only difference is the name of the colonial Power, South Africa.

66. Moreover, there are many indications that South Africa is reviving in Namibia its attempts to create an internal solution. It is doing so while keeping world public opinion occupied by appearing to be interested in the implementation of the internationally recognized plan for independence. There are signs of South African prevarication, entrenchment and political manipulation in Namibia, not of a preparedness for a peaceful transition to independence. As a matter of fact, if, again, the past history of Namibia is of any significance, South Africa will be likely to raise one obstacle after another on the path leading to the attainment of the fundamental rights of the people of Namibia.

67. Simultaneously, the continuation of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa more than 16 years after its Mandate was terminated by the United Nations poses a dangerous and increasing threat to peace and security in southern Africa. The stability and well-being of independent African States are being attacked constantly by the South African régime, which is bent on preserving its hold over Namibia and subjugating its neighbours to its unjust policies.

68. In these circumstances, every effort needs to be exerted to persuade South Africa to agree to the expeditious implementation of the plan for the independence of Namibia. Otherwise the grave consequences of a further prolongation and aggravation of the existing situation would necessitate the taking of the urgent and decisive measures envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations.

69. In concluding, I wish to say that my Government, in conformity with its firm commitment to the struggle against all forms of colonialism and racial discrimination, fully supports and has faith in the just cause of the people of Namibia and is confident of their final victory. My Government is committed to all the efforts being expended by the United Nations to achieve the full sovereign independence and territorial integrity of Namibia. We sincerely hope that this round of meetings of the Council will lead us to that objective in the shortest possible time.

70. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): I should like first, Sir, to extend to you my friendliest compliments on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month, and my most sincere appreciation of the able and dedicated way in which you have already conducted our work, even into the early hours of one recent morning. Your country and mine have always enjoyed bilateral relations unmarred by any controversy and forged stongly over many past centuries. I am convinced that the same friendly relations will project into the indefinite future.

71. I also wish to compliment your predecessor, our good friend and colleague, Mr. Noel Sinclair of Guyana, for so valiantly carrying the burden of the Council presidency during September.

72. We are meeting in gravely troubled times, with an unusually heavy burden of responsibility falling on the Council. Malta is anxious that no opportunity should be lost for the Council to reduce tension and to exercise its proper role in world affairs. We have even made a sincere effort to provide for this against unexpected contingencies.

73. On this particular issue of Namibia, we have already stated our position in our statement before the Council on 31 May 1983 [*2449th meeting, paras 37-56*]. In the interests of the efficient conduct of our work, we do not wish to repeat the main elements as we see them, especially since many eloquent statements, particularly those of the front-line African States and of the United Nations Council for Namibia, have already done full justice to the present phase of our discussions. So has the authentic representative of the Namibian people, the people whose unfettered future should be the sole focus of our concentrated attention today.

74. There are therefore only a few additional points I now feel compelled to make. First and foremost, I should like to express the gratitude of my delegation to the Secretary-General, not only for so efficiently carrying out the tasks assigned to him under Council resolution 532 (1983) but also for clearly stating, with commendable brevity and realistic insight, all the compelling reasons which should prompt us to move forward in our united effort to ensure the attainment of the long-desired independence of Namibia. The contents of paragraphs 24 to 29 of his report [*S/15943*] synthesize the whole story. I feel they should be taken as a whole, without any selective quotation.

75. On a bleak international horizon, the dawn of Namibian independence beckons with a constant ray of hope. That is the wish long held by the Namibian people, and also, let us never forget, by the international community as a whole, irrespective of what one member may conveniently argue to the contrary. Obviously, one more major effort is still needed after a review of the stage we have now reached.

76. My delegation has therefore listened carefully to all the participants in the debate. We are pleased by the evident progress achieved, which has been acknowledged by all. Since we are so near, even though our final objective may not yet have been attained, we must not be distracted from our main approach; nor should we allow any divisive elements to break the unity of ranks which so commendably has characterized the peaceful approach of the United Nations, in particular the Council, since the unanimous adoption of resolution 435 (1978)—five weary years ago, perhaps, but constantly nourished by hope and by steady progress.

77. The main elements that South Africa is now emphasizing, as one more unfortunate pretext for delay, are not new. They can be easily dismissed, since they were already present at the time the Council resolution was unanimously adopted, and yet no reference was made to these so-called obstacles at that time.

78. If East-West tension has unfortunately increased since then, it is not only South Africa that is feeling the consequent pernicious effects. But even so, that is no valid reason for South Africa—or any other country for that matter—to renege on its international obligations. On the contrary, it imposes an even stronger responsibility for avoidance of situations that might further exacerbate international tension.

79. I need hardly stress that one certain prescription for increasing such tension would, in fact, be generated if South Africa were to deny to the Namibian people the exercise of their right to independence. This would be detrimental not only to Namibia, but to neighbouring countries, and these of course include South Africa itself. Once more, therefore, we appeal to the Government of South Africa not to choose short-term objectives, but finally to embark on a new chapter in writing the human and political history of the southern part of the African continent by making its important contribution towards removing the last vestiges of the colonialist attitude from the region of southern Africa and promoting good-neighbourly relations.

80. We also call on the influential friends of South Africa to utilize to the fullest extent possible, and as never before, all their powerful means of persuasion in the continuing effort necessary to convince South Africa that it should allow progress to proceed unhindered, by being more

accommodating in the interests of the "sacred trust" to which it has paid so much lip-service in the past, but which, unfortunately, it has not yet upheld in practice.

81. Once more, we wish to commend SWAPO and the front-line States for their co-operative attitude, which stands in marked contrast to that of South Africa. We commend in particular the repeated readiness of SWAPO to negotiate a cease-fire.

82. Once more we commend the patience and forbearance of the Namibian people themselves, and renew to them the assurance of our modest but continued support in their peaceful quest for independence.

83. It is now fairly and squarely South Africa's long-overdue turn to show in practical terms its stated commitment to Namibian independence. It cannot deny, as regards the wishes of the Namibian people themselves, that these can best be determined by the people concerned, in a free and secret ballot on the basis of universal suffrage, rather than by any contrived and unrepresentative system superimposed by South Africa. We are convinced that any slurs against the impartiality of United Nations assistance in the exercise of Namibian self-determination is, unfortunately, but one more figment of South Africa's anachronistic phobia against genuine freedom and equality.

84. As regards our best method of approach, I continue to believe that another unanimously adopted resolution would further augment the current political impetus for tangible progress. We therefore hope that all Members—without any single exception—will contribute to that need. As I said on a previous occasion:

> "The invaluable resources of a collective and concentrated international effort, backed by the dedicated efforts of the Secretary-General and his team, constitute an irresistible tide for final victory. South Africa should join, rather than impede, this final sprint." [*2449th meeting, para. 55.*]

85. A unanimously adopted resolution at this juncture would unmistakably confirm to South Africa that it stands alone, isolated in its obsolete philosophy, decades behind the real requirements of modern times. The current debate, and the resolution adopted, should leave South Africa without even a shadow of a doubt as to the real wishes of the international community and, in fact, conclusively demonstrate that South Africa's self-assumed confidence of international support is absolutely unfounded.

86. The draft resolution just introduced, which Malta has been pleased to join in sponsoring, provides the working basis for a concerted, peaceful and unanimous approach.

87. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Bulgaria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

88. Mr. TSVETKOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like first of all to thank you personally, as well as the members of the Council, for giving me this opportunity to participate in the Council's debates on the question of Namibia. Allow me also to congratulate you on your assumption of the responsible office of the President of the Council for the month of October and to express my conviction that your wealth of experience and diplomatic skill will contribute to the solution of the important tasks facing the Council.

89. I should also like to express my appreciation and my deep esteem for your predecessor, Mr. Noel Sinclair, the representative of Guyana, for the exemplary way in which he discharged his responsibilities as President of the Council for September.

90. This is the second time this year that the Council has been asked to consider the question of the continued occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of Pretoria and to take steps to ensure the immediate implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations, including those of the Council itself, on the granting of independence to the Territory.

91. World public opinion, through its most competent international forums, has for years now been categorically and consistently expressing its solidarity with the people of Namibia and with their just and legitimate struggle against colonial occupation and for self-determination, liberation and national independence. The resolutions of the General Assembly, as well as all the decisions of the Non-Aligned Movement and of the OAU, invariably stress that the racists are in Namibia illegally and that they must withdraw from the Territory immediately. This position is supported by all peace-loving States.

92. During its present meetings, the Council has had another opportunity to hear statements by a large number of delegations from all geographical regions and of different shades of political opinion, who have expressed more forcefully than ever their concern at the deadlock in the efforts to grant independence to Namibia. The overwhelming majority of delegations that have already spoken in the Council's debate have clearly stated that the only path leading to a peaceful solution to the Namibian problem remains the prompt implementation of the appropriate resolutions of the United Nations, including Council resolution 435 (1978) setting forth the United Nations plan for the granting of independence to Namibia, a plan which should be implemented without any amendment or subsequent distortion and without the introduction of any extraneous element that has nothing to do with the plan. It is quite clear to all, or virtually all, those present in this hall, as well as to the overwhelming majority of world public opinion, that the right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence does not depend, and cannot depend, on any external factors or interests whatsoever. Furthermore, it is also quite clear that foreign interests—those of the racists and their imperialist protectors—are directly responsible for the continued suffering of the Namibian people and the other peoples of southern Africa. My delegation considers that any reference to the so-called security interests of Pretoria expresses cynical disdain for the legitimate rights of those peoples

and constitutes open support for the colonialist and racist policy of that régime.

93. Namibia's history is one of colonial domination, genocide and racism in its most overt and extreme manifestations—that is, the policy of *apartheid*, repression, exploitation and plunder, poverty and brutal violations of fundamental human rights.

94. The people of Namibia have never resigned themselves to this situation. In recent years, the heroic struggle for self-determination and independence, under the leadership of its vanguard, SWAPO, has become a movement of national resistance against the occupiers, a struggle whose legitimacy is expressly recognized by the United Nations and the OAU. In spite of the categorically expressed will of the Namibian people to be free, and in defiance of United Nations decisions that for 17 years now have declared the end of South Africa's Mandate over the Territory and called for the immediate cessation of its occupation, South Africa has continued brazenly to disregard the will of the world Organization. Namibia has been turned into a veritable military base. The 100,000 racist soldiers occupying the country are waging an aggressive colonial war against its people.

95. All the United Nations resolutions on the subject demonstrate that the persistent and firm support given to South Africa by the United States and certain other Western countries, as well as their co-operation in many fields with the racist régime, provide the necesary basis for the continuation of its inhuman policy. Strengthened by that support, Pretoria is intensively carrying out acts designed to destabilize the Governments of neighbouring sovereign African countries. Confident in its impunity, and showing once again its disdain for world public opinion, South Africa perpetrated a fresh act of banditry at the very beginning of this series of Council meetings by launching a piratical attack against the capital of Mozambique. Bulgaria firmly condemns this brutal violation of the rules of international law, which once again demonstrates just how far the policy of constructive engagement between Washington and Pretoria can go.

96. Events during the five years following the adoption of Council resolution 435 (1978) have shown that South Africa and the United States Administration are pursuing a co-ordinated policy aimed at perpetuating colonial domination over Namibia, consolidating the *apartheid* régime, exercising pressure and destabilizing the Governments of the front-line States to compel them to adopt a policy to the liking of the imperialists and the racists. Washington's policy is motivated by its ambition for world supremacy, which is at the root of all its actions everywhere in the world, the most recent expression of which has been the events in Grenada.

97. The growing aggressiveness of United States policy as conducted by the present Administration can be seen clearly in its persistent attempts to impose arbitrarily a link between the question of Namibia and the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. Attempts to link these two questions, which have nothing in common, reflect the continued efforts of Washington and Pretoria to delay the granting of independence to Namibia and strengthen the illegal racist occupation of the Territory. Furthermore, these attempts constitute overt and flagrant interference in the internal affairs of sovereign Angola and are meant to limit its right to self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, and destabilize and topple its legitimate Government. There can be no doubt that the wide-ranging aggression against and the occupation of large parts of Angolan territory by South Africa are aimed at attaining the same objectives by force of arms.

98. Bulgaria resolutely condemns and categorically rejects the policy of Pretoria and Washington to link the question of the independence of Namibia to the presence of Cuban troops in Angola and insists that aggression against that country and interference in its internal affairs should cease. We hope that, at this series of meetings, the Council will condemn and reject that policy. Previous debates in the Council have confirmed that to be the will of the international community.

99. The Council must also take decisive measures to guarantee the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978) by setting a firm deadline for its implementation and, if that deadline is not respected, by imposing comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter.

100. My country's position was reiterated during the visit to Bulgaria a few days ago of the President of SWAPO, Sam Nujoma. On 18 October last, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and President of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, met with Mr. Nujoma and condemned the attempts of the racists and their Western allies to impose a neo-colonial solution to the Namibian problem and stressed that Bulgaria firmly supported the position that full authority should be transferred to SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. He expressed the unfailing militant solidarity of the Bulgarian people with the just and legitimate struggle of the Namibian people and its vanguard, SWAPO.

101. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

102. Mr. RAJAIE-KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran):

> "O mankind! We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes, that ye may know each other (not that ye may despise each other). Verily the most honoured of you in the sight of God is (he who is) the most righteous of you. And God has full knowledge and is well acquainted (with all things)."*

* Quoted in Arabic by the speaker.

Today the Council is deliberating on the problem of Namibia. Namibia is another victim of imperialism and international Zionism, whose mother base is in the United States and two of whose major satellite bases are in Palestine and South Africa. The problem of Namibia is, like that of Palestine, a perennial international problem which apparently cannot be solved by the United Nations.

103. Certain problems which fall within the scope of the Charter of the United Nations—and these are very few in number and very small in size—can be solved on the basis of the Charter and the usual methods of international parliamentary procedure. These are problems which do not question the fundamental presuppositions and axioms of the international body: routine issues of international aviation; international telecommunication matters; matters of relief assistance to drought-stricken people; relief work in the event of natural catastrophes such as earthquakes; Red Cross matters; simple border conflicts; bilateral conflicts of a certain kind—not all of them, of course; some of the issues of the International Monetary Fund—certainly not all of them; some minor local or regional economic or educational problems; these are examples of the kinds of problems that do not call into question or come into conflict with certain presuppositions of the international body and which can very happily be solved by the United Nations.

104. However, there are certain international issues which both precede and go beyond the Charter and its presuppositions, not only historically speaking, but also theoretically and structurally. The problem of nationalism, for instance, is beyond the scope of United Nations problem-solving machinery, because instead of the United Nations encompassing it, it encompasses the United Nations. The United Nations is based on the concept of nationalism; the nation-State concept of political entities is axiomatic in the very structure of the United Nations and its Charter. That Charter, therefore, cannot provide for that problem and is not equal to it.

105. Other issues are imperialism and international Zionism, which are essentially beyond the scope of the United Nations problem-solving tradition. The United Nations is as wretched a victim of imperialism and international Zionism as is Namibia itself. That is why the problems of South Africa and Israel remain perennially untouched issues in the context of United Nations diplomacy; and whenever they are brought up here, in a sort of innocent, naïve and emotional manner, they are wrongly introduced as the problems of Namibia and Palestine. This is because people, or at least some people, want to sympathize with, pat, patronize and pacify the victims without touching the criminals, or because they want to deceive themselves by dealing with the façade, the surface effect, and not with the cause.

106. The poor United Nations and its miserable Charter—to which some hypocrites refer as if it were a divine code—are too small to solve the problems of imperialism, international Zionism, racism, communism and materialism, and their immediate by-products, such as the problem of the Middle East, including Palestine, the problem of Afghanistan, the problem of South Africa, the problem of Nicaragua and other similar problems.

107. The problem of South Africa is not basically different from the problems of Zambia, Ghana, Namibia, Tanzania, or the whole of Africa. But when that problem comes to the United Nations it becomes isolated from the rest of its body and remains a perennial issue, like that of Zionism and the Zionist base in the Middle East. These problems—whether the Organization's procedures and Charter admit it or not—are slightly bigger than the ball-game of the United Nations, and they must be considered in a broader context, which goes far beyond the United Nations and those presuppositions which are axiomatic in the entire international body.

108. The genius of the founders of the Non-Aligned Movement was that they realized full well that certain problems unquestionally fall beyond the scope of the United Nations system and cannot be solved within it. But, unfortunately, being themselves professional statesmen and politicians interested in quick solutions, they started the Movement on a practical basis and were unable to open a theoretical front to meet the challenge of meta–United Nations issues. Thus, they failed to realize that when many more United Nations Members, with their own preoccupations and propensities, joined the Non-Aligned Movement in order to make it more universal, they would metamorphose the entire Movement into a body like the United Nations, either parallel or similar to the United Nations, and maybe subservient to it, but anyway always beneath it. That is why in all other international bodies, such as the Non-Aligned Movement, the OAU and the organizations of Latin American countries, everybody makes sure that nothing goes against the Charter, the rules of procedure or the resolutions of the United Nations. Even in the Organization of the Islamic Conference—which is supposed to be Islamic—if something contrary to the Charter or the resolutions of the United Nations comes about, everybody becomes hysterical.

109. Thus, in all those international bodies, which are in fact independent of the United Nations and are supposed to be forums for consideration of meta–United Nations issues, we cannot do very much, because all those bodies have, willy-nilly, become like sub-committees of the United Nations. They deal with exactly the same issues, use the same methods and paperwork, and have the same resolution-type ends and objectives.

110. Even the United Nations ritual "At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I have to congratulate you", is carefully preserved, and the recital of a verse from the Holy Koran, which is common practice in all Islamic gatherings, is sometimes ignorantly forgotten in our Islamic Conference meetings.

111. We have all of us therefore deprived ourselves of an arena in which meta–United Nations issues, like that of Namibia, could be resolved in an entirely different, more comprehensive and more encompassing context. Whenever we bring those issues to the United Nations, without

knowing whether a given issue really falls within or without the scope of United Nations diplomacy, we find ourselves in a deadlock. The result can be nothing but deadlock, because we want to take political actions against a Member which, according to the Bible of the United Nations, has every right to veto our decisions. At this stage let us forget about the bilateral relations that exist among the holders of the veto power and some of the victim countries and the impact those relations have upon United Nations diplomacy. I simply mean, let us at this stage condone and overlook many other things.

112. Under such circumstances we want to solve the problem of Namibia here, and that problem inevitably dissolves into the silly and irrelevant argument that if the Cubans leave Angola then the United States will smile and will treat the Angolans more kindly by pretending to oppose some of the *apartheid* policies of South Africa. We press—the Council presses—for resolutions and the United States simply vetoes them. United States imperialism is a gigantic mountain, and the diplomatic pressures exerted on it here are like the soft, beautiful spring rainfall. The diplomats of the United Nations who want to break down United States imperialism with resolutions seem like soft-hearted, innocent and primitive people looking forward to the total erosion of that mountain by the annual spring rain. Do you know how many years you will have to wait? The answer is: for a complete geological period, through only three of which we have passed since the creation of the earth—and we have not yet completed the fourth.

113. Some small, soft hills and hill-tops can be washed away naturally or manually by water, but some need dynamite, not United Nations resolutions. We in the Islamic Republic of Iran have found our forum, its charters and its correct international perspectives in the Holy Koran. We think that others also need a theoretical or ideological frame of reference; they too need a charter and a different cosmological—and thus international—perspective, armed with which they can seriously challenge and eradicate imperialism, materialism, Zionism and other international meta-United Nations complexities. We have also come to the conclusion that communism and other leftist trends and pseudo-ideologies are, essentially, as materialistic as capitalism and that they cannot solve the problems of mankind. Instead, they themselves add to the problems that are already in hand.

114. Our foreign policy of leaning neither to the East nor to the West is not, therefore, an emotional position taken in anger towards either the Russians or Americans. Its basis is not animosity against Westerners or Easterners, nor does it stem from such animosity. Rather, for us it is a new approach to solving many human problems, only some of them meta-United Nations issues, and we regret that we have not yet been properly understood.

115. Let us go back to the problem of Namibia. The problem of Namibia cannot be resolved without an honest and sincere understanding of its components, namely, United States imperialism and imperialist interest in Africa, and the presence of natural resources and some rare and expensive radioactive metals, such as uranium, copper, oil, precious stones and other valuable substances for which arrogant Powers are killing the local people, in the first instance, and ultimately themselves, if necessary. The East seems to have the upper hand in this struggle, because it begins with some sort of ideology—good or bad—which it gives to the people. However, the West has no ideology to offer. It goes therefore not to the people but to Governments. And since Governments are usually supposed to represent the people, those who work with the people and on the people thus have an advantage. If the American Administration is honest in its belief in democracy, then the people of Angola and elsewhere in Africa have every right to be friendly with any country they like and to follow any ideology they like. They have every right to tolerate or befriend any other country and then to decide how bad or good a given ideology may be and, like other people in other parts of the world, to fight against those ideologies if they wish to do so. But they must have the right to choose.

116. However, all the good things in Africa are too seductive to be easily overlooked by multinational corporations and their Governments. Those Governments therefore resort to very nasty practices through multinational groups and Zionist agents in South Africa and in Palestine. The same multinational companies determine the nature and Government policies of Western Administrations that have veto rights here, and have allies and other satellites in addition to their main and secondary puppets in the United Nations. Now, we bring up Namibia here, not from the viewpoint of what the oppressed people of Namibia and the *apartheid*-stricken people of South Africa really need, but from the viewpoint of instructions from well-known Governments.

117. I should therefore like to address all the representatives here, and particularly those from Africa, not as diplomats but as ordinary, honest people who understand all the dimensions of the issue. If they have any concern for the people of South Africa, I urge them to report the situation back to their Foreign Offices in such a way as to persuade them not to see the situation as an ordinary international issue but rather as a meta-United Nations issue that can be resolved only through the united collaboration of African countries, standing independent of all affiliations and leanings towards either West or East. If those countries can have an independent OAU, different from the United Nations and ready to transcend the artificial, silly, nationalistic identities and boundaries of Africa that are now ossified and fortified on that continent, then they can do something for Namibia and for the rest of Africa. Otherwise they cannot do very much. Thus the solution to the problem of the people in the southern part of Africa, as well as in the rest of Africa, inevitably lies in the hands of those revolutionary groups that are struggling to break down the existing political structure that is now subjugating them.

118. As for the arrogant Power—and, particularly, as for Western arrogance—if they honestly do not want bloodshed and human suffering, they have to make concessions—some concessions, at least the minimum that the United Nations resolutions suggest.

119. But our ultimate solution in Iran is simply Islamic; it stems from the verse in the Holy Koran which I quoted at the beginning of my statement and which means something very simply. It means: Believe in God, surrender to His will and His commandments as they are in the Holy Koran. Do not fear anyone but Him. Obey no one save Him. And there you are all free and equal; the nearest of you to God is the most righteous of you.

120. I regret that I cannot see the international body as being anything but very remote from that solution.

The meeting rose at 1.45 p.m.

NOTES

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 28th meeting*, para. 51.

[2] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971*, p. 16.

[3] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 24*, part two, chap. II, sect. B.

[4] *Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, Paris, 25-29 April 1983* (A/CONF. 120/13), annex IV, sect. A. 4.

[5] XLIX: 13.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-60205—June 1992—2,050